THIS OPINION WAS NOT WRITTEN FOR PUBLICATION

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today (1) was not written for publication in a law journal and (2) is not binding precedent of the Board.

Paper No. 16

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

_____

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

_____

Ex parte STEPHEN P. KROSNER
and FLOYD W. SHACKELFORD

_____

Appeal No. 95-5021
Application 07/929,082[1]

_____

ON BRIEF

_____

Before MARTIN, FLEMING and CARMICHAEL, Administrative Patent Judges.

CARMICHAEL, Administrative Patent Judge.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is an appeal from the final rejection of Claims 1-8, which constitute all the claims remaining in the application.

Claim 1 reads as follows:

[1] Application for patent filed August 12, 1992.

1. A method in an object oriented programming environment within a data processing system for enhancing the efficiency of entry of operator inputs into a plurality of operator input fields utilizing a complex object, said method comprising the data processing implemented steps of:

establishing said complex object within said object oriented programming environment;

associating said complex object with an attribute, wherein said attribute is associated with said plurality of operator input fields;

associating a plurality of objects with said complex object within said object oriented programming environment, each of said plurality of objects being associated with a different one of said plurality of operator input fields;

associating said different one of said plurality of operator input fields with a plurality of operator inputs for each of said plurality of objects;

permitting an operator to select said attribute utilizing a graphical user interface included within said data processing system;

in response to said operator selection of said attribute, utilizing said complex object to automatically determine within said data processing system a plurality of permitted combinations of said plurality of operator inputs, wherein each of said plurality of operator inputs determined within said data processing system is associated with said different one of said plurality of operator input fields for each of said plurality of objects;

presenting for selection by an operator said plurality of permitted combinations;

permitting an operator to select one of said plurality of permitted combinations; and

in response to a selection of said one of said plurality of permitted combinations, automatically entering each of said plurality of operator inputs included within said one of said plurality of permitted combinations into said different one of said plurality of operator input fields for each of said plurality of objects.

The examiner's Answer cites the following prior art:

Southerton, Programmer's Guide to Presentation manager, "Control Windows", Chapter 7, pages 205-213 (1989).

Unruh, Data Based Advisor, "Zip/Clip", Vol. 8, No. 12, p. 108 (1990).

OPINION

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Unruh in view of Southerton. We reverse for the reasons given by Appellants amplified as follows.

The examiner's rejection relies on interpreting the claims as "sufficiently broad to read on any data base look up function based on and returning multiple fields." Examiner's Answer at 4. As for the claim term "object," the examiner states that "any combination of related pieces of code and data may be considered an object." Examiner's Answer at 7. According to the examiner, the claim term "complex object," refers to an object that is complicated. Examiner's Answer at 5.

Claims undergoing examination are given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, and limitations appearing in the specification are not to be read into the claims. ***In re Etter***, 756 F.2d 852, 858, 225 USPQ 1, 5 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Therefore, the interpretation must be both "reasonable" and "consistent with the specification." The examiner's interpretation is neither.

The examiner's interpretation is not reasonable because, as demonstrated by Appellants, the claim terms "object oriented environment," "object," and "complex object" have certain meanings in the art. Appeal Brief at 5. The terms do not refer to "any database look up function" as the examiner contends.

Moreover, the claims are specifically limited to "an object oriented environment." Therefore, even if it were reasonable to say that an "object" could be any combination of code and data, it would not be reasonable in this case which is limited to a specific environment.

The examiner's interpretation is not consistent with the specification, which states that "[a]n object generally has a library of methods which are essentially unique to an object, giving an object its specific behaviors." Specification at 9, lines 9-11. This is inconsistent with the examiner's interpretation that "any combination of related pieces of code and data may be considered an object." Examiner's Answer at 7. Moreover, the description of Appellants' figures 3, 4, and 5 confirms that "object" has a specific meaning in the art.

CONCLUSION

The rejection of Claims 1-8 is not sustained.

REVERSED

JOHN C. MARTIN	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	BOARD OF PATENT
MICHAEL R. FLEMING	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	APPEALS AND
	)	
	)	INTERFERENCES
	)	
JAMES T. CARMICHAEL	)	
Administrative Patent Judge	)	

JTC/pgg

Andrew J. Dillon
Felsman, Bradley, Gunter & Dillon, LLP
Suite 350, Lakewood on The Park
7600B North Capital of Texas Highway
Austin, Texas 78731